

From: [Schofield, Susan](#)
To: [Mishkin, Katherine](#)
Subject: RE: next MW figures
Date: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 3:00:05 PM

Katy, I didn't get your questions below. I will respond by each one. Please feel free to call me if additional discussion will clarify things. Hopefully we can talk with Denise tomorrow too.

From: Mishkin, Katherine [mailto:Mishkin.Katherine@epa.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 2:38 PM

To: Schofield, Susan

Subject: FW: next MW figures

Sorry, I realized I didn't send this to you.

-Katie

From: Mishkin, Katherine

Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 2:15 PM

To: Mishkin, Katherine; Zeno, Denise

Cc: Hauptman, Mel; Metz, Chloe

Subject: RE: next MW figures

Hi Susan and Denise,

I'm not sure what your timeframe is for getting in these wells, but I would definitely like to talk before you do. I'm a little thrown off by how some of the figures do not match the data in the accompanying excel worksheets. For example, the summary table shows that soil results at EcstasyQPrints, specifically EQ-SB-05A, were 4500 ppb for cis-1,2-DCE, ND for TCE, and 9.9(B) for PCE. However, the soilgw_draft figure at this potential source area shows concentrations associated with EQ-SB-05A to have 13.11 of TCE, 62.71 of PCE, and no reported detections for cis. **THE INDIVIDUAL PSA FIGURES ARE FOR THE FIELD GC RESULTS ONLY. THE OTHER RESULTS YOU REFERENCE ARE FOR THE LAB CONFIRMATORY SAMPLES, WHICH WE HAVE NOT HAD TIME TO PLOT ON FIGURES. PER THE WORK PLAN, WE SENT 1 CONFIRMATORY SAMPLE TO THE LAB FROM EACH PSA FOR SOIL AND GW (IF ENCOUNTERED).**

Considering 4500 ppb of cis in soil at Ecstasy and 440 ppb in groundwater at D'Elegant Fantastic Dry Cleaners, we should be targeting these areas as source areas. Currently, there seem to be 6 potential source areas and only one well is being proposed at each of these locations. However, based on some of these confirmatory results, we maybe should be acting accordingly and focusing on the areas that actually appear to be true source areas more so than those where we are getting non-detect results in soil. **KATY, WE ARE COLLECTING SOIL SAMPLES FOR CLP ANALYSIS AT THESE FACILITIES AS PART OF THE PSA EVALUATION. MOST OF THESE PSA PROPERTIES ARE SO SMALL THAT ONLY 1 MONITORING WELL WILL "FIT" AT EACH PROPERTY. WE CAN DISCUSS THE MW LOCATIONS AND STRATEGIES WHEN WE TALK.**

I'm also a little confused with the zoomed out map of the area that shows all the source areas and proposed monitoring well locations because some of the wells have labels (i.e. MW-12S, MW-14S), but in the zoomed in piecemeal figures of each source location, none of the well points match the numbers referred to in the zoomed out map. **THE FIGURE THAT SHOWS ALL OF THE SOURCE AREAS IS JUST TOO SMALL TO BE ABLE TO SHOW THE MONITORING WELLS (OR OTHER SOIL/GW SAMPLING LOCATIONS). THAT IS WHY WE DID INDIVIDUAL SOURCE AREA FIGURES TOO. THE MWs ON THE BIG SOURCE AREA FIGURE ARE THOSE THAT ARE NOT WITHIN THE PROPERTY BOUNDARY OF THE PSAs, BUT ARE MEANT TO BE "LINKS" TO CONNECT THE GW CONTAMINATION**

FROM PSAs TO THE CONTAMINATED ANA MARIA WELL.

A conversation about this would be really helpful just to get up to speed on what's been going on at the site and to get a better idea of what is being considered for these additional well installations. Again, I'm available the rest of today or tomorrow after 1:30. Let me know what works for you.

Thanks!

Katie

From: Mishkin, Katherine

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 3:13 PM

To: Zeno, Denise

Cc: Hauptman, Mel; Metz, Chloe

Subject: RE: next MW figures

Hi Denise,

Since you are requesting next day turnaround, I think a call with CDM would be a good idea. I haven't really worked on Cabo Rojo since January 2012, so an overall update on the site would also be helpful.

I briefly looked at the locations for monitoring wells and it seems like they are mostly in potential source areas, but it's usually one or two wells per source area and the areas are spread out pretty far from one another. Also, I may need some help with some of the figures regarding getting my bearings, since there are minimal references provided. Some maps have hand drawn temporary groundwater and soil locations, but no data to accompany them, so it would be helpful to have these data as well.

Lastly, there is no information on the construction details of the wells. I see they have a 5' depth, so I assume these are all going to be screened in the overburden, but further details on this would also be great to have.

With a conference call tomorrow to gather more information, I will better be able to accommodate your request to review these on a quick turnaround.

I have a meeting at 9am, but should be free at 10.

Katie

From: Zeno, Denise

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 11:48 AM

To: Mishkin, Katherine

Cc: Hauptman, Mel

Subject: FW: next MW figures

Katherine,

can you please take a look at the proposed MW locations and provide feedback by tomorrow? if you want we can set up a conference call with the contractor tomorrow to discuss the proposed locations.

I'm sorry about the rush but the contractor sent me the proposed locations this week. It seems the driller will be out next week in the field.

Denise

From: Schofield, Susan [SchofieldSE@cdmsmith.com]

Sent: Monday, May 13, 2013 11:55 AM

To: Zeno, Denise

Subject: next MW figures

Two attached

Susan E. Schofield, P.G.

CDM Smith

1225 Ponce de Leon Avenue
VIG Tower, Suite 603
San Juan, PR 00907
schofieldse@CDMSmith.com
787-722-5428
203-645-2549 (mobile)